

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8           UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9           WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10           AT TACOMA

11           GEORGE O. MITCHELL,

12           Plaintiff,

13           v.

14           HENRY RICHARDS,

15           Defendant.

Case No. C05-5114FDB

ORDER RE CLARIFICATION OF  
DKT # 9 AND APPEAL OF DKT # 10

16       By Order filed February 16, 2005 (Dkt. # 4) Magistrate Judge Strombom required Plaintiff to  
17       cure certain deficiencies in his motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, explained what Plaintiff needed  
18       to do to correct them, and gave Plaintiff a date by which to do so. Plaintiff appealed this order (Dkt.  
19       # 7) and the Court denied the appeal (Dkt. # 9). Plaintiff now moves for “clarification of Dkt #9  
order.” (Dkt. # 11)

20       The Magistrate Judge entered a Second Order To Show Cause (Dkt. # 10) again delineating  
21       the deficiencies that Plaintiff must cure regarding in *IFP* application. Plaintiff has also filed an  
22       “Appeal to Judge of Order Dkt # 10 REQUEST FOR SELF RECUSAL” (Dkt. 12). Chief Judge  
23       Lasnik denied the recusal request citing the reasonableness of the Magistrate Judge seeking  
24       additional information on the *IFP* request.

25  
26 ORDER - 1

1 The remainder of Plaintiff's appeal is before the undersigned for consideration. Plaintiff's  
2 appeal in view of the previous appeal of this claim is frivolous and is denied.

3 || ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED:

9 DATED this 17<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2005.

  
FRANKLIN D. BURGESS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE